DT 926
H97
Copy 1

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE TRANSVAAL QUESTION

...BY...
ROBERT BUTCHESON, Esq.

Price, 10 Cents

This pamhlet, by the generous permission of the Author, has been reprinted by the British-American Association, of Columbus.

Address all communications concerning this pamphlet to the President, British-American Association, in care of A. H. Smythe, Bookseller and Stationer, 43 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

Tract No. 1—June, 1900.

"Happy is he who understands the causes of things."—Cicero.

The Truth

About

The South African Question

BY

R. HUTCHESON, ESQ.

Of the District Bar; Late Ohio State Senator.

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1900.

D.M.
8 N'00.

DT926
.H97

The Truth About the South African Question

Mr. Webster Davis, of Kansas City, late Assistant Secretary of the Interior, has just returned from a visit to the scene of hostilities in South Africa, and has taken to the lecture platform to tell the American people what their duties are in the British–Boer war. He thunders considerably in the index, but whether the execution of his self–appointed task shall keep pace with the vigor of his pronunciamento, which has not always been the case in adventures of this kind, remains to be seen.

In the laughable comedy of Thisby and Pyramus it was thought necessary to give assurance to timid ladies in the audience that there was no live lion on the stage with veritable teeth and claws, the prologue telling them plainly that what appeared to be a lion was not a lion, but only "Snug, the joiner," a "man as other men are." The most superficial observer in pit or proscenium in Mr. Davis' Opera House gatherings will not be deceived concerning the true nature of the exhibition without a prologue to announce it!

"The knight of the sorrowful figure" started out from his

native village to tackle wind-mills with pretty much the same views and feelings as the late "spell-binder" enters his career of knight-errantry. He claps a barber's basin on his head, believing it to be Mambrino's helmet, mounts his oratorical Pegasus and sails into John Bull with all the dash and daring of his renowned archetype. He also carries a lance at rest for William McKinley, if he fails to be convinced of his duty and refuses to send the army and navy to the assistance of the Boers. Pity our modern Don Quixote has no faithful squire like Sancho Panza to disillusion his mad master and to instruct the world with his apt proverbs, such as "Fast bind, fast find; less talking and more doing; for he who shuffles is not he who cuts, and a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." "Many think to find bacon, when there is not so much as a pin to hang it on; but who can hedge in the cuckoo — especially as God himself is not spared." "He who seeketh danger perisheth therein," and so on in exhaustless streams of practical wisdom. He says he has resigned the snug position he held in order that he might not be embarrassed with the popular supposition that he was speaking for or representing the Administration which he helped bring into power by his persuasive eloquence, and to which he is indebted for distinguished favor. It seems to me this was a work of supererogation. It carries no evidence that either President McKinley or Secretary Hay ever entertained the slightest idea of making Mr. Davis their organ of public policy on this subject or any other, in office or out of office, and the public credulity must be inconceivable that will

suppose for a moment that in what he has to say he will reflect the sentiments of either the President or his Secretary. It must occur, however, to the most enthusiastic admirer of the Kansas City orator, if not to his own sense of propriety, that it would have been more ingenuous in him to resign before making the visit to equip himself for his wordy campaign against Great Britain in this country. The Courts of Europe did suppose that, occupying the position of Assistant Secretary of an important Department of the Government, Mr. Davis must have gone to South Africa in some official capacity. Nothing of the sort existed, and no embarrassment came to the Government in connection with it. There was a difference between Davis and Macrum. The consul to Pretoria fled from fright and tried to unload upon his Democratic admirers a cock-and-bull story about British interference with his mails. The redoubtable "spell-binder" loves the "pomp and circumstance of glorious war," and had no objection to bullets if they only came from Boer Mausers and brought down the Britishers.

The walls of Jericho tumbled down before the blasts of a ram's horn — this was in an age of miracles — but in these days things go along in a natural way — and we will probably not behold the Administration go down nor the British Empire collapse before the elocutionary performance of this wonderful prodigy from Missouri!

In his opening lecture the other evening in this city, Mr. Davis does not appear to make any valuable contribution to the Boer cause. He draws on his imagination for his facts of

history and employs declamation for argument. Commonplace platitudes are his postulates and rounded periods his conclusions. Mr. Davis says the article in the agreement of 1881 as to suzerainty was eliminated in the Convention of 1884. He says England took sides with the Basutos in their war against the Boers. Why, if England had not sent the red coats to the rescue the Boers would have been wiped from the face of the earth. Such gross errors and misinformation show what value should attach to any of his statements. He evidently gets his facts and his ideas of the British–Boer question while hob-nobbing with Kruger, Steyn and Reitz while at their capitals or traveling in their luxurious private cars in which he made discoveries as remarkable as those of the famous Gulliver in his travels. British statesmen and soldiers are all of Lilliputian proportions, while those of the Boers are decidedly Brob-dignagian. His attempt to get the truth from Oom Paul is about as amusing as the discovery of Gulliver at the Academy of Lagado, where he found a professor at work on a process he claimed to have invented to extract sunbeams from cucumbers! Cæsar wrote the immortal words, "I came, I saw, I conquered." Webster Davis declares, "I came, I saw and I know it all," a greater achievement than that of the great Roman.

As citizens of the world — especially since we have become one of the first of world-powers — the people of the United States will have opinions on the merits of public wars or other questions affecting the relation of nations to us or to each other — but until a crisis is reached which calls for interference,

it is a breach of national etiquette for any citizen, high or low, to attempt to array our people in favor of one and against another of two belligerents. If Mr. Davis' talk should develop into action by any of his deluded followers, he and they would be liable to arrest for violation of our neutrality laws. It is natural and excusable for our hyphenated fellow-citizens to sympathize with the cause of the fatherland, right or wrong, or with their countrymen in revolted colonies — but their allegiance as alien subjects has been forsworn when they take sides as active partizans. They have no moral right to espouse the cause of another people which might compromise their adopted country.

Talk about foreign "entanglements." It could take no worse shape than for our citizens — native or foreign-born — to unite and divide for party purposes on the affairs of outside nations. For writing a letter to a former British subject a few years ago advising him how to vote in a presidential election, a British Minister had to quit the country. But the Anglo-American citizen himself would not have been justified if he had voted, or persuaded other citizens of British birth to vote in the supposed interest of Great Britain. Such a policy might lead to the total absorption of one country by another, or foment faction and civil war.

Our people naturally and properly sympathize with the struggles for liberty the world over. It was so in the South American struggle to throw off the Spanish yoke — it was so when Henry Clay in 1824 raised his eloquent voice in the senate in behalf of Greece against the Turks — it was so when Kos-

suth came to our shores to plead the cause of the brave Magyars against the despotism of Austria — and the last evidence of it was when we compelled Spain to retire from Cuba — but in all these cases our path of duty was clear.

The Boers in the so-called Dutch republics are not at all in the same category, as I shall endeavor to show.

It is a pitiful spectacle to see a few thousand misguided Boers pitted against an empire of millions, but if a great Empire has rights and interests to defend against an unjustifiable revolt, who is to blame?

On the 9th of October, 1899, the Boer government issued its ultimatum to Great Britain, which was tantamount to a declaration of war, and the Boers immediately invaded British territory. The civilized world must therefore hold them responsible for the commencement of the war, and for its terrible train of consequences. What could England do but accept the gage thrown down?

In March, 1899, 21,000 British subjects in the Transvaal had petitioned the home government for protection against the spoliation and tyranny of the Boer government — "to secure the speedy reform of abuses complained of, and to obtain substantial guarantees for a recognition of their rights as British subjects." If a Power like England had turned a deaf ear to the just complaints of so large a number of her subjects, she would have received and deserved the contempt of mankind. The Union Jack would have floated over a nation of cowards. Their dead heroes would have turned in their graves!

It is natural to sympathize with the "under dog," but it is often proper to consider how the "under dog" got into that particular predicament. If a big mastiff turns upon his smaller tormentor — always snapping at his heels, and even seeking to drive him off his own grounds by a conspiracy with other dogs — the edge is considerably knocked off the sympathy!

Seriously, the strong common sense of the American people begins to detect the humbug of this false plea of "liberty" for the Boer — common sense, I say — which, according to the humorous Senator from Alabama, is the first thing your genuine orator discards.

As I view the subject interest and sentiment both unite to direct the sympathies of the American people to the side of Great Britain, not to that of the Boers, in the war now going on in South Africa.

The success of British arms, of which I think there is no doubt, means the ultimate consolidation of the Transvaal and Natal countries from the Zambesi to the Cape — something like the Dominion of Canada — and this will mean widening markets for our expanding commerce; it will mean a railroad from the Cape to Cairo, more sale of steel bridges, locomotives and rolling stock — more demand for the inexhaustible products of our farms and manufactories. English defeat will mean the relapse of that portion of the "Dark Continent" into barbarism — the closing of the doors that have been opened to trade — setting back the hands on the clock of progress. It is not a time to look with indifference to such a prospect when all eyes

are now turned to the magnificent possibilities of our commerce in other lands than Africa.

As to the principle involved, the conditions are just the reverse of what the pro-Boer agitators are trying to make the people believe. On the part of England it is a war of Democracy against Oligarchy — a war of freedom against tryanny. On the part of the Beors, it is a war to impose taxation without representation and to deny freedom and equality to all men.

Strange to say, Kruger and his advisers stand to-day where George III and Lord North stood in 1776, while Great Britain stands where the patriots of the Revolution stood when they demanded that taxation and representation should go together.

In numbers, as I learn from reliable statistics, the Uitlanders constitute about three-fourths of the population of the Transvaal, and although they pay nine-tenths of the taxes of the country, they have no voice or share in the government. About 90 per cent. of these people are British subjects, mostly attracted, it is probably true, by the rich gold fields in the Rand, but thoroughly identified with the country as property holders, and otherwise. The term applied to them by the Boers means "foreigner," but "newcomer" would be a more accurate description. At any rate they are British subjects, entitled to all the rights and privileges enjoyed by natives; and all the "Conventions" between Great Britain and the Boer government secured them these rights, but these agreements have been wantonly disregarded.

Such a thing as freedom of the press does not exist. Under

existing laws the President of the South African Republic can, with the consent of his Council, forbid the circulation of any printed matter; and at his discretion he can prohibit the circulation of any newspaper he chooses to suppress. Public meetings can be held only with the sanction of the Government, and may be broken up by order of the police under authority of law. They have religious tests — Roman Catholics are excluded from offices of all kinds.

Corruption and bribery run riot in the administration of public affairs — between 1883 and 1898 the debates in the Volksraad show that on advances to officials there is no less than $11,400,000 unaccounted for. The Secret Service fund in 1898 amounted to $99,000, an amount far in excess of the British Imperial estimates.

From 1886, when Uitlanders began to come in numbers, to 1899, the budgets show that the salary list has increased from about 52,000 pounds sterling to about 1,216,000; that is to say, twenty-four times larger in thirteen years! Members of the Volksraad are notoriously bought to grant concessions of all kinds; which has resulted in the most grievous monopolies; the principal of which is the Netherlands Railway Company — owned by a syndicate of Holland and German capitalists — the tariff rates putting a burden upon shippers and travellers without parallel for extortion. Next to this is the dynamite monopoly extorting from the mine operators $3,000,000 annually — the difference between the import price and duty and the price paid the monopolists. Then everything else of indispensable use by

the Uitlanders is the subject of a "concession"— matches, paper, chocolate, wool, starch, mineral waters, soap, oils, and many other articles mentioned in the Blue Book issued by the Colonial Secretary.

The law prohibits the sale of liquor to natives. But all restriction has been removed to allow rich pickings to Kruger's relatives and retainers in the way of "concessions," with the result that drunkenness has been the rule on the Rand with the inevitable accompaniment of crime and accident.

The judges are all subservient to the President of the Republic, who can dismiss any judge at pleasure. There is no trial by a jury of his peers for the Uitlander. "Pass-laws" for colored subjects exist which would have been a disgrace to our country in the days of slavery. Police officers can enter houses without warrant, which no King of England could ever do, and treat people, white and black, with the grossest brutality without accountability. They shot down a British subject in his own house at Pretoria for no offiense but defending himself in the street against a blackguard.

Talk about religion and a sense of justice among the Boers. Their religion is hypocrisy and their justice is to demand everything and concede nothing. Cromwell and his Puritans were fanatical but they were sincere, and Oom Paul and his so-called "farmers" are demonstrative in their religious profession, but like Satan quoting Scripture, it is for a devilish purpose. At Majuba they fired into ambulances full of the wounded and flying the Red Cross! They released prisoners on foot and then

shot them down in broad daylight! The treatment of the condemned "Committee of Reform" in the Pretoria jail after the Jameson raid is scarcely inferior in horrors to the Black Hole of Calcutta.

Under the Alien Expulsion Act of 1896, the President had power to expel any Uitlander without any trial whatsoever. The Alien and Sedition laws of the old Federal party in this country, which revolutionized our politics in 1800, and wrecked a great political party, were moderate and just compared with the Boer law. The Transvaal government has claimed the right in time of war, either to compel the services or seize the property of British subjects, and to levy a special war tax upon them, and it can be done under the law as it stands. The English language is forbidden in public documents and proceedings. In the schools the regulations are such that out of $315,000 raised in Johannesburg, only $3,250 is spent on British children, and no grant is made to the voluntary schools, which are some of the best in the Transvaal.

In Johannesburg there are 23,000 Uitlander votes to 1,000 Boers, and yet the Boers elect an equal number of the members of Council, while the Chairman has to be a Boer, and the decisions of the Council are subject to confirmation by the Executive. The municipality of Johannesburg, with a population of 100,000 has really less power than the old Sanitary Committee when it was a mining camp! In 1874 the franchise only required one year's residence without real estate. In 1882 five years' residence and registration were required. Registration

has become so complicated that it takes fourteen years to obtain the franchise, during twelve of which the Uitlander is neither a British nor a Boer subject, and the law may be so construed as to deny the franchise to any one altogether. Petitions signed by 40,000 Uitlanders went up to the Volksraad for redress of grievances, but they were "spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne."

All these abuses produced such discontent that the Uitlanders formed a "National Union" at Johannesburg, which threatened to fight for its rights. This led to the Jameson raid in response to a request by the Uitlanders for aid in 1895, followed by defeat of the raiders and the disarmament of Johannesburg. It has been said that this raid was instigated by British officials. The record proof is that Dr. Jameson was warned by the British agent at Pretoria not to make the move. But the material thing to consider is, not how the raid originated, but the fact that it emphasized a situation that demanded intervention. It showed the acute stage of the trouble much like Spain's treatment of the Cubans before we intervened.

Appeals for redress were then made to Sir Alfred Milner, Governor of Cape Colony, and High Commissioner for South Africa. In reviewing the situation, this officer declared: "The case for intervention is overwhelming." Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and the English government sustained his view. We interfered in Cuba for less reason. The United States has no "suzerainty" there, and it requires an extreme case of abuse, under international law, to warrant the intereference of one Power in the

domestic affairs of another. That condition existed in Cuba in the opinion of Congress, and if the Republics of South Africa had been independent Powers, which they are not, the situation demanded interference by England quite as much as the disorders in Cuba required the intervention of our government for its own safety and welfare.

The result of the situation was a meeting between Milner and Kruger in May, 1899, at the Capital of the Orange Free State. Terms of settlement could not be agreed upon and the Boers declared war.

We will look in vain through Jefferson's arraignment of George III for grievances worse than those of the Uitlanders at the hands of the Boer government, and yet the Declaration of Independence is invoked to condemn England and sustain the Boers in this war.

Why did all attempts to preserve peace prove abortive? It was because a conspiracy had been formed under the name of the "Afrikander Bond" to drive the British flag from South Africa. Kruger, President of the South African Republic; Steyn, President of the Orange Free State; and Reitz, State Secretary of the Transvaal, headed this conspiracy. They wanted no settlement. Reitz was the brains of the movement, as the Tagal leader recently captured in the Philippines was the brains to Aguinaldo. This propaganda was started just after the Convention of 1881. It must be patent to every one that at that time England harbored no oppressive designs, for she had just granted the independence of the Transvaal for internal affairs

— she had no intention of making war on the republics, for she had just made peace — no intention of seizing the gold fields in the Rand, for they were not yet discovered. Intoxicated by Majuba Hill, and believing that the dream of a Pan-Afrikander Republic was about to be realized, Reitz issued a "manifesto" shamelessly charging the Queen of England, the British nation, Chamberlain, Milner and the British Cabinet with being "murderers" and "robbers." It must have been a happy day for the Transvaal Secretary when he sat down to pen his ultimatum a year later to Great Britain which he knew meant war. It opened up visions of the future Republic for which he had been plotting for years.

Let us get down to the bottom facts in this bloody business in South Africa — apply the law to them — and see where it will lead us. In 1486 — six years before Columbus discovered America — Bartholomew Diaz, a Portuguese navigator, sailed along the west coast of Africa on a voyage to discover a new ocean road to India. He reached a bold headland which he called the Cape of "Storms," but which was renamed by King John, the Second, the Cape of "Good Hope." Other navigators of different nations followed until 1591, when the English flag was seen at the Cape for the first time. In 1602 a charter was issued at The Hague to the Dutch East India Company. The fleets sent out by this Company prevailed over the Portuguese in India where they had established themselves, and in the many voyages to India the Dutch made a calling station at Table Bay on the Cape until, in 1652, they established a colony. In

1658 they unfortunately introduced slavery. The colony rapidly fllled up by permanent settlers coming from Holland, including the Hugenots, who had fled from France upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. General Joubert, late Boer commander, was a descendant of the Huguenot colonists. The children of Dutch gardners, German mechanics, and Huguenot tradesmen, migrating from place to place with their herds, sleeping in tents or wagons, and free from the restraint of civilized life, reverted in habit and thought to the condition of semi-barbarism, which grew stronger and stronger with each succeeding generation, which at last culminated in their hate for all foreigners. The next object of their hatred was the missionaries, who exposed their cruelties to the Blacks.

At the outbreak of the war between England and France in 1803, Cape Colony belonged to the Netherlands; but in 1806 Louis Napoleon was made king of that country and England in the same year attacked the Cape as a French possession, and the authorities of the Cape capitulated. This was title by conquest. British occupation was made permanent by a Convention signed in 1814 between Great Britain after the Dutch had regained possession, and the Netherlands, by the terms of which England paid $30,000,000 for cession of the colony and of other Dutch colonies, which now form the colony of British Guiana. This was title by conquest and purchase like our title to the Phillippines.

Public sentiment in England would no longer tolerate slavery; and so in May, 1833, the act of emancipation was passed

to free all slaves throughout the British dominions. A compensation of $100,000,000 was granted to the slaveholders, the grandest and noblest act done by any nation in the history of the world. The value of the 40,000 slaves held by the Dutch in the Cape was $15,000,000, but the Imperial Government awarded only $1,250,000, made payable in London, which worked inconvenience and loss, but no greater hardships were put upon the colonists in the Cape than in the West Indies. In the end emancipation was best for all, as it has been in our own country.

By the acquisition of Cape Colony from Holland the sovereignty was transferred to Great Britain and the Dutch colonists became subjects of the British Crown. The distinction between direct "sovereignty," "protectorates" or "suzerainty" and "spheres of influence" has always been recognized. Great Britain claimed as falling within her influence, though not within the limits of her direct sovereignty, the interior back country as well as the coast, south of the 25th degree of South latitude, which is the latitude of Delagoa Bay, then, as now, a Portuguese possession. This claim has always been admitted by the Powers interested in the occupation of Africa. The Boer emigrants or "trekkers" from Cape Colony were warned by British authorities that within the limits of British influence they could not divest themselves of their quality as British subjects nor establish any form of government other than that of the government of the British Crown. These warnings will be found recorded again and again by official documents. As early as 1836 Parliament passed an act, called the "Cape of Good Hope Pun-

ishment Act," by which offences committed by white persons in any part of Africa south of latitude 25 degrees were made cognizable in the Cape colonial courts.

The relations between the Dutch and the British settlers who poured into the Colony towards the close of the eighteenth century, were not harmonious; and in 1836 large numbers of the former "trekked" for the wilderness at the north and east, and founded the two colonies of Orange and Natal, whose northern boundary was the river Vaal, but they were still claimed as, and were in law, British subjects. Upon resisting British authority they were reduced to submission in 1848, and then a large number of them jumped into their wagons and again "trekked" across the Vaal, in pursuit of the *ignis fatuus* of isolation and independence, about as the Mormons "trekked" from the border towns of the West into Utah, establishing the "State of Deseret," expecting to escape the jurisdiction of the United States for the undisturbed enjoyment of their "peculiar institution." They asked to be let alone that they might treat the Gentiles as they pleased. A Democratic President sent a little army out there to tell them it could not be done and to stop their foolishness. The peculiar thing about the Boers was their desire to escape the influences of modern civilization and preserve that of the sixteenth century.

In their new homes the Boers had a hard experience. They maintained a precarious existence by frightful contests with wild beasts — Kruger himself is said to have killed 250 lions — the fabled Hercules only killed one — and against hordes of hostile

savage tribes — the Zulus on their east, the Matabeles on their west and the Kaffirs in their very midst. The British army went to their assistance and it is more than doubtful whether the white settlements could have maintained themselves without this aid.

The colony was in bad financial condition, having less than one dollar in the Treasury. England not only furnished soldiers to subdue the savages, but furnished the money to pay foreign debts and to put the distressed and impoverished colonists on their feet again.

The Boers present a remarkable phenomenon in history. The usual result of bringing two races in contact, one enlightened and the other savage, has been to lift up the inferior race, but in this case the superior has seemed to sink to the level of the inferior.

They have all the traits of the savage — cunning, suspicion, cruelty and treachery. Boer means "farmer" but in truth these people are nomads and hunters. Their implements are the whip and the gun more than the hoe and the plow. They never liked to work. Their chief complaint against England when they first wandered into the wilderness was that she emancipated their slaves.

They make their women perform the drudgery on the "farms," and have always more or less evaded the strict measures of England to prevent the reduction of the Kaffirs to practical slavery by indenture. It was slavery of the cruelest kind. They have been known to hitch Kaffirs to their wagons to haul heavy loads across the veldt. The reason they can put

nearly every male, boys and men, into the field, is that they are trained to the use of the gun. They are the best sharpshooters in the world because they are the best hunters.

They know nothing of the world's advance in the last two hundred years and want none of it. The wonderful resources of their country was a sealed book to them until developed by outsiders. They plastered their rude cabins with blue mud permeated with diamonds and didn't know it, and walked over gold beds without seeing them. If England were to withdraw tomorrow the result would be about the same as if we should withdraw from the Philippines — tribal wars and anarchy and ruin — and unless England should return to do her work over again — foreign Powers would step in to restore order and divide the territory among themselves. Originally the Transvaal was divided into four little republics at constant war with each other for supremacy, until in 1864 Pretorius succeeded in concentrating the power in his own hand like a dictator. But his government only existed in name. There was no revenue because the Boers refused to pay taxes, and in 1872 it died of inanition. Pretorius was succeeded by Pastor Burger, who tried in vain to bring order out of chaos.

In 1877 Great Britain annexed the Transvaal country, not as a conquest, or the price of protection, but as the assertion of her paramount sovereignty. Burger, the then President of the so-called "State of the Transvaal," thus addressed the Volksraad on the subject of annexation: "It is asked, what have they (the English) got to do with our position. I tell you, as

much as we have to do with that of our Kaffir neighbors. As little as we can allow barbarities among the Kaffirs on our border, as little can they allow that in a state on their borders anarchy and rebellion should prevail." Kruger himself at that time favored annexation and actually took office under the English, demanding nothing but an increase of salary until he began scheming for the Presidency. He made a successful appeal to the irreconcilables and succeded in undermining the influence of the enlightened Burger, who wished to lead his people in the ways of reform and progress, by accusing him of heresy because he did not believe the Devil had a tail, as he is represented in the Dutch Bibles!

By the first convention of 1852 the Boers recognized this sovereignty in making terms as to internal government and establishing boundaries. Two years later came an analogous agreement called the Bloemfontein Convention, creating the Orange Free State, which got along peaceably and happily until drawn into a conspiracy by the Boer leaders to drive Great Britain out of South Africa. But the Boers mostly disliked annexation, and in 1880 they resorted to arms. They won a great victory at Majuba Hill, and the British Government was willing to come to such terms as would remove irritation and secure peace. By a Convention signed at Pretoria, the Capital of the Republic, in 1881, Gladstone's government restored independence to the Transvaal, now known officially as the South African Republic. What did this mean? It was expressly stipulated that the English Crown should have a veto power over the internal policy of the Re-

L. of C.

public as to the Kaffirs, and that it should control and conduct its entire foreign policy, except as to the Orange Free State, reserving the right to move troops over its territory in time of war.

The Boers continued to chafe more and more under British control, although it was a mere shadow of authority, because the leaders were secretly working and plotting for absolute independence and to oust England from all power in South Africa. Gladstone proposed a new convention to adjust differences, when there was really no substantial complaint. Then came the Convention of 1884 at London. Out of deference to Boer sensitiveness the word "suzerainty" used in the Convention of 1881 was omitted, and complete independence was granted in domestic affairs. Though the word "suzerainty" was dropped, the thing itself was asserted in another form. All the foreign relations of the Republic were left under the complete control of the British government by the right of veto in the Queen. Except in name the paramountcy of Great Britain exists over the Transvaal as much as over the dominion of Canada, Australia or New Zealand.

Speaking of the Sand River Convention of 1852 Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has said:

"The power and authority of England have long been paramount and neither by the Sand River Convention of 1852, nor at any other time, did Her Majesty's Government surrender the right and duty of requiring that the Transvaal should be governed with a view to the common safety of the various European communities."

On the same subject Lord Derby has said:

"The Sand River Convention, like the Convention of Pretoria, was not a treaty between two contracting Powers, but was a declaration made by the Queen, and accepted by certain persons at that time her subjects, of the conditions under which, and the extent to which, Her Majesty could permit them to manage their own affairs without interference. It did not create a South African Republic, with a political organization and defined boundaries.'"

Speaking of the Convention of Pretoria in 1881, Lord Kimberly says:

"Entire freedom of action will be accorded to the Transvaal Government, so far as it is not inconsistent with the rights expressly reserved to the Suzerain Power. The term 'Suzerainty' has been chosen as most conveniently describing superiority over a state possessing independent rights of government, subject to reservations with reference to certain specified matters."

Lord Derby thus describes the London Convention of 1884:

"The noble Earl (Earl Cadogan) said that the object of the Convention had been to abolish the Suzerainty of the British Crown. The word 'Suzerainty' is a very vague word, and I do not think it is capable of any precise legal definition. Whatever we may understand by it, I think it is not very easy to define. But I apprehend, whether you call it a Protectorate or a Suzerainty, or the recognition of England as a paramount Power, the fact is that a certain controlling power is retained when the state, which exercises the Suzerainty, has a right to veto any negotiations with which the dependent state may enter

with foreign Powers. Whatever Suzerainty meant in the Convention of Pretoria, the condition of things which it implied still remain; although the word is not actually employed, we have kept the substance. We have abstained from using the word because it was not capable of legal definition and because it seemed to be a word which was likely to lead to misconception and misunderstanding."

Mr. Chamberlain, in his dispatches of December, 1898, and July, 1899, thus construes the two Conventions of 1881 and 1884:

"The contention of the Government of the Republic, 'that the South African Republic is a Sovereign International State is not, in their opinion (*i. e.*, that of Her Majesty's Government), warranted either by law or history, and is wholly inadmissible.' The preamble of the Convention of 1881 laid down the basis of the future mutual relations between Her Majesty and the inhabitants of the South African Republic. To these inhabitants Her Majesty granted internal independence. To herself she reserved the position of Suzerain. The Article of the Convention of 1881 defined alike the general character of the internal independence and the suzerainty.

"The Article of the Convention of 1884 substituted a fresh definition for a former one. The preamble of the Convention of 1881, the basis on which these definitions rested, remained unchanged. If that preamble had been repealed, not only would the reservation of suzerainty on the part of Her Majesty have been repealed, but also the grant of internal independence to the inhabitants of the South African Republic."

The "Preamble" to the Convention of 1881 was this:

"Complete self-government subject to the suzerainty of Her Majesty, to the inhabitants of the Transvaal territory, upon cer-

tain terms and conditions, and subject to certain reservations and limitations." Any doubt as to the existence of the suzerainty in the Convention of 1884 is removed by an examination of the circumstances under which the Convention of 1884 was signed. The Transvaal delegates to London requested the British Government to do away with the suzerainty by making the proposed Convention a treaty between two Powers. This the Government refused to do on the ground that the Transvaal was not in fact an independent power, nor was it intended that it should be represented as such. So the issue was definitely raised by the Boers themselves before the Convention was signed, and decided against them.

When Gladstone came in on the wave of "Little England" sentimentality to succeed Beaconsfield, the Boers confidently expected that the annexation of 1877 would be annulled and the suzerainty abandoned. But they soon found that the Gladstone in opposition was not the same person as the Gladstone in office, and when Kruger and his advisers asked him to carry out the policy he had announced in his public speeches, the new Premier sent the following dispatch:

"Under no circumstances can the Queen's authority in the Transvaal be relinquished. Looking to all the circumstances, both of the Transvaal and the rest of South Africa, and to the necessity of preventing a renewal of disorders which might lead to disastrous consequences, not only to the Transvaal, but to the whole of South Africa, our judgment is that the Queen cannot be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal."

On the 20th of May, 1880, the Queen, in her speech announcing the policy of the new Government, declared: "In maintaining my supremacy over the Transvaal, with its diversified population, I desire both to make provision for the security of the indigenous races and to extend to the European settlers institutions on large and liberal principles of self-government." But Gladstone had sown the wind and the whirlwind was not far off.

Of course the Boers have what is called the "right of revolution"— which is no right at all unless successful — and without giving any reason, they may throw off the power of British suzerainty, and so has Great Britain the right to put down rebellion against her authority. This is the law of the case, and until these people show themselves more worthy of independence it is idle to waste any sentiment on them. "The tools to them that can use them," said the Great Napoleoen. Our Fathers were familiar with the tools of liberty, and succeeded in 1776 because they deserved success. The Boers will fail because they have shown themselves unworthy of independence or liberty. The people to the north of us enjoy the freedom of British subjects, and if they wanted independence and should give expression to public opinion to that effect in any authoritative manner — England, in my opinion, would not send a single soldier to prevent it. The same thing may be said of Australia, and even in India if the time should ever come when the natives could be entrusted with the responsibilities of self-government, they can have independence of the British Crown.

Our people admire the courage and heroism with which the Boers fight, but they cannot avoid asking the question, What is it for? To accomplish three things: To perpetuate the Kruger Oligarchy, rob the foreigners, and enslave the Blacks.

The great nations which rule the world will ask, What is the use of the Dutch Republics if these are the principles they represent, and if this is their usefulness? And what interest have we in preserving their independent political life, if they are only obstacles in the path of civilization?

On the other hand, the prospect is better for the Boers if they fail than if they succeed. As an integral part of the British Empire, with a large measure of autonomy — with truly representative government — an uncorrupted judiciary — with adequate police, schools, railroads and those liberal institutions which make British colonies like the Cape the freest countries in the world, their condition will be much better.

Both the conventions of 1881 and 1884 were sad mistakes in British statesmanship. Instead of applying cataplasms of words to cover a sore, it should have been cauterized by heroic treatment. This war was inevitable and should have been fought twenty years ago! Gladstone was a great man, but he was soft and vacillating. He blundered in Ireland when he refused to listen to the just complaints of that unfortunate island, but he lived to correct his false views and helped to do a tardy act of justice, and were he living to-day he would see his mistake in his colonial policy. When affairs reach a crisis like that in South Africa it is only war can make peace.

Yellow journalism in England drove Robert Cecil to suicide on false charges, and maudlin sentimentalism sought the impeachment of Warren Hastings for alleged wrong-doing in India, but the judgment of Englishmen is at last just, and both the great English Viceroys stand vindicated. The same influences swept the British cabinet from its feet in 1884. Cecil Rhodes was right. What England wanted was more iron and less sentiment in its South African policy. The Midlothian electorate had the "conscience," but Kruger carried off the plunder!

It is said England is actuated by greed. The gold fields have been of infinitely more advantage to the Boers than to Great Britain. The wealth drained from them has enabled the Boer Republics to become military Powers far out of proportion to their population. They have organized armies — equipped them with modern guns — constructed roads and built fortifications. The disasters they have inflicted upon the British, and the victories they have won are all due to the gold fields. But suppose greed was the motive, what of it? Greed has been the animating principle of all the branches of the great Teutonic stock since its history began. It is not the same as it was in the days of Hengist and Horsa — nor the same that characterized the invasions of the Danes and the Saxons — in modern times it has been restrained by justice and tempered by "benevolent assimilation." It is better that the springs of human progress should be moved by avarice and selfishness than they should not be moved at all. It was greed that took Canada away from the French — a little enterprise in which our liberty-loving an-

cestors played no small part — but who would now exchange the activity of our progressive Anglo-Saxon neighbors at the north for the slow methods of the Latin race? And what have we been doing on our own hook since that time? Louisiana Purchase, Florida, Texas, California, and the other territories acquired from Mexico, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and most probably Cuba, Guam, the best part of the Samoan group, have all been taken in — not by conquest it is true — but it would require a pretty fine political alembic to determine the exact proportions of "greed" and "humanity" in the acquiring motive. In view of all this history — and it is only our first hundred years — it comes with a bad grace from us to upbraid England for her "greed;" and in view of her noble attitude in the late war with Spain when we were confronted with serious complications abroad, it is positively indecent for any portion of our people to attempt to throw obstacles in her path now that her trial has come.

If the Dutch East India Company had not raised the price of pepper on the London merchants in the seventeenth century, no rival company would probably been started in England to raise its own pepper, and thus lay the foundation of British empire in Asia! If Egypt had not defaulted to British bondholders, we never would have heard of Omdurman, nor the expulsion of the dervishes from the Soudan — and the land of the Pharaohs might now be rejoicing in a new life from Fashoda to the minarets of Cairo. English shot and shell battered down the gates of China in 1842, and if opium went in, so did

the missionary, the church, the school, the factory and the railroad. We applaud our able and patriotic Secretary of State for his brilliant diplomacy in securing from the Powers interested in the future of China a guaranty of the "open door" for our expanding commerce in the far East. But it must not be forgotten that it was England alone that was first to formulate, more than half a century ago, that broad and just principle of international dealing in the Celestial Empire which made this grand result possible. In India she has given the world a successful example of colonial policy for inferior races and warring religions by uniting the Hindoo and the Mohammedan in the same peaceful and progressive government, rejoicing in the renaissance of the Aryan race at the very cradle of its origin. England is now in South Africa — as we are in the Philippines — not as a robber or tyrant — but as the standard-bearer of civilization to dispense the blessings of liberty with law — and neither we nor our Anglo-Saxon cousins will run away from a duty enjoined by destiny!

NOV 10 1900

The Following Books

Are recommended for the careful perusal of all who are interested in the History of the Transvaal, and of the Briton-Boer Conflict.

The Truth About the Transvaal,

By William Robins. Price, 25c.

Great Britain and the Dutch Republics.

Price, 10 cents.

The Transvaal Trouble.

By John Martineau. Price, 75 cents.

The Truth About the South African Question.

By R. HUTCHESON, Esq. Price, 10c.

The Transvaal Trouble.

By John Hays Hammond. Price, 25 cents.

The Above Prices are all Postpaid.

Copies of the above can be obtained of

A. H. SMYTHE,
Bookseller and Importer,
Neil House Block, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 019 920 562 6